THE
QUARTERLY JOURNAL
OF THE
MYTHIC SOCIETY

Vol. LVI] July 1965 [No. 2

THE CHINESE REFERENCE TO PALLAVA NARASIMHAVARMAN II

K. S. VAIDYANATHAN, B.A., F.R.A.S.

Some recent writers maintain that Pallava Narasimhavarman II commenced his reign in 700 A.D. and that he ruled from that date up to 728/29 A. D.[1]. The bases for such statements about this Pallava, are that a lunar eclipse occurred in his twelfth regnal year, that his reign in 720 A.D. gets striking confirmation from the Chinese reference to him, and that a reference to Narasimha's successor exists in a record of the Western Chālukya Vijayāditya dated in his thirty-fifth year copied from Ulchala in the Kurnool District.[2] In this paper we are concerned with the Chinese notices about the Pallava king Narasimhavarman II, a critical examination of which not only disproves the first two assertions, but also helps in disclosing the apparent impossibility of a reference to his successor in the record of 730-31 A.D.

The history of Vajrabodhi, is found in the biographical notices in the *Soung-kao-seng-tchoan*, the *Siu-kou-kin i-king t'ou-ki* and the *K'ai-iuen-chi-kiao lou*, and the fullest and the most

1. N. Lakshminarayana Rao: *J. I. H.* Vol. XXX. p. 291-2; P. B. Desai: *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXIX. p. 92.; D. C. Sircar: *Classical Age.* p. 280 ff.
2 Ancient India No. 5. p. 54; of *J.I.H.* Vol. XXXV. No. 90.

accurate is furnished by *Tcheng-iuen sing-ting-i-kia mou-lou*, compiled by *Iuen-tchao* at the beginning of the ninth century.[3] "Vajrabodhi studied at Nālanda till he was twenty-six years old; then in 689 he travelled as a pilgrim as far as Kapilavastu and directed his course towards South India, the centre of the cult of Avalōkitēśvara. The kingdom of *Kien-tchi* (Kāñchī) had then for three years been afflicted with a desolating famine, and the king *Na-lo-seng-kia pou-to kia-mo* (Narasimha Potakarman, *Corr.* Varman) implored the assistance of the monks. By means of *dhāranis*, Vajrabodhi brought down rain. A vision next ordered him to visit Ceylon and go and worship Mañjuṣrī in the Middle Empire. He crossed the sea, was received with respectful ceremonial in Ceylon and there adored the holy relics, particularly the Tooth of Buddha deposited at the Abhaya-rāja-vihāra where he remained six months. Then he started towards the south-east, to ascend the Laṅkā-parvata. On the way, he stopped at the Stūpa of Buddha's eye, then arrived at the city of the Seven Jewels, and passed into the kingdom of *Lou-ho-na* (Rōhaṇa). The king of this kingdom was the follower of the Hīnayāna school. Vajrabodhi remained there a month in order to explain to him the Great Vehicle (*Mahāyāna*). When at last he reached the foot of the mountain, he found the country wild, inhabited by wild beasts and extraordinarily rich in precious stones. After long waiting, he was able to climb to the summit and contemplate on the impression of Buddha's foot. From the summit he saw on the north-west the kingdom of Ceylon, and on all other sides the ocean. At the foot of the mountain an enclosure of vegetation traced out as it were the rampart of a city; the natives said it was the city of Laṅkā. The savages of the district came themselves to pay homage to the Master. He then returned to South India where he was welcomed back with as much honour and pomp as on his first departure. He expressed to the king his desire to go to China to worship Mañjuṣrī and propogate the doctrine. The king at first tried to dissuade him from the undertaking, pointing out the extreme difficulty of the voyage; but, eventually, yielding to

3. *J. R. A. S.* (C. B); Vol. XXIV. p. 87.

his entreaties, decided that an embassy should go, which, in accordance with precedent, was to carry presents to the Emperor. He charged the Commander-in-Chief *Mi-tsoun-na* to offer, in his name, a Sanscrit copy of the *Mahā-prajñā-pāramitā*, some jewels, stuffs and perfumes. The departure of the embassy took place with great pomp. Vajrabodhi invoked Mañjuṣrī on the East and Avalokitēśvara on the West. The mission set sail with farewells from the king, the ministers and a multitude of people and first put into port at *Po-tchi-li* in Ceylon, which was reached in twenty-four hours. Thirty-five Persian ships were there already, having come to take precious stones in barter. When the Persian merchants saw Vajrabodhi, they followed him with one impulse. The King of Ceylon, *Chi-li-chi-lo* (Śri-Śilā), learning of the Master's return, invited him to stay in his palace. After a month's sojourn Vajrabodhi took leave of the king and started off, still followed by the faithful Persian merchants. A month's voyage brought them to *Fo-chi* (Bhōja), the king of which met the mission and presented him (Vajrabodhi) with a golden parasol and a golden bedstead. The end of the voyage was disastrous; all the merchants' ships were dispersed by a tempest, and Vajrabodhi's ship alone, after a long series of misfortunes, reached Canton, whence he arrived at the Eastern capital in 720."[4]

All that could be said, without any fear of contradiction, from the above narration in the Chinese sources is that

(1) Narasimhavarman was ruling at Kāñchī in A.D. 689.

(2) the famine which lasted for three years, from 686 to 689, during his reign, was relieved by Vajrabodhi's intervention and divine powers of bringing rain; *i.e.* Narasimha was ruler of Kāñchī in 686-689.

(3) Vajrabodhi reached Ceylon, where he remined for six months in the Middle Empire, visiting holy places, and then went to Rōhaṇa kingdom where he remained a month, and then

4. *J. R. A. S.* (C.B). Vol. XXIV. pp. 88-9. : K. A. N. Sastri : *Foreign Notices of Southern India*, Introduction, pp. 17-18.

visited the Buddha's foot, staying there for sometime. Then he returned to South India. This may be placed in 690.

(4) His return to South India, was to the land of the Pallavas wherefrom he departed to Ceylon in the first instance. This may be placed in 690-1.

(5) As there is nothing to show that he stayed in the Pallava country for any appreciable length of time before he requested the king to help him to go to China, this may be dated in 691-2.

(6) The king's attempt to persuade Vajrabodhi to desist from the venture having failed, the embassy was fitted out according to precedents, with presents, etc. and the king accompanied by his ministers, saw the departure of the embassy with Vajrabodhi, from the shores of the Pallava country. This may reasonably be placed in 691-2.

(7) The journey to Ceylon, landing in the island, stay for a month and subsequent departure, and arrival at Bhōja after a sea voyage of a month, may all be placed in 692.

(8) The departure of Vajrabodhi and the embassy from Bhōja towards China was in that year, *i.e.* in 692.

(9) According to the Chinese account, the end of the voyage was disastrous, all the merchants' ships dispersed by a tempest, and Vajrabhodhi's ship alone, after a series of misfortunes, reached Canton, whence he and the embassy arrived at the Eastern Capital. And this the Chinese account places in 720.

Recently many errors in the reign periods of the kings of Ceylon have been discovered and a thorough investigation of the several synchronisms available with reference to the island's chronology has been made afresh, and a reassessment of all the evidences available on the subject has been undertaken by the veteran Sinhalese archaeologist and epigrapist Dr. S. Paranavitana[5], and the results of his laborious and thorough researches show pointedly that the error of twenty-three years which Dr. Hultzsch had discovered in the chronology of the

5. *Ep. Zeylanica.* Vol. V. pp. 86ff.

kings of the island during the first half of the eleventh century could not be blindly carried backwards to any century, much less to the seventh century in which Mānavamma ascended the Sinhalese throne with the help of Pallava Narasimhavarman. Of pointed interest to our present enquiry is the finding of Dr. Paranavitana that the period of Mānavamma was A. D. 684-718[6]. It is a well-known fact that this king obtained his throne with the help of the army given by Pallava Narasimhavarman, and this fact revealed in the Mahāvaṁsa, shows that that Pallava king was ruling at Kāñchī in A.D. 684, the date of Mānavamma's accession. And this is in agreement with the fact that Narasimhavarman was ruling at Kāñchī in 686-689, when according to the Chinese account, Vajrabodhi visited his country.

The prevalence of the famine in the Pallava country during the reign of Narasimhavarman, referred to in the Chinese account, is corroborated by the mention of the fact that Rājasimha restored the *ghaṭikā* of Kāñchī in the Velūrpālayam plates[7] of Nandivarman III. The famine is also referred to in Daṇḍin's *Avantīsundarīkathā*, from which it is learnt that the poet had to wander about the country, along with his associates, leaving the court of Rājasimha, owing to the severity of the famine. Roads had become deserted and people suffered much while families perished. Thus we see that the statement in the Chinese account that there was a famine raging in the Pallava country during the reign of Narasimhavarman and that it was subsequently relieved is fully confirmed by the Indian sources, and that the king of Kāñchī in *circa* 686-689 was Narasimhavarman is corroborated by the Sinhalese chronicle, which states that Mānavamma ascended the throne with the help of Narasimhavarman, in *circa* 684.

Scholars have relied on the Chinese notices to show that Narasimha II was ruling in 720, the date when the embassy reached China. Though we are assured of corroborative

6. *Ibid.* p. 110.
7. *S.I.I.* Vol. II. p. 511 *v.* 13. Narasimha II "once again organised the *ghaṭika* of the twice-born (*i.e.* Brāhmaṇas)".

evidences to the first reference in the Chinese accounts, as to the king's ruling at Kāñchī in 686-689 at the time of Vajrabodhi's visit and of the then prevailing famine, from Sinhalese and Indian sources, we have as yet no such confirmation to the second reference which leads to the inference of the extent of the rule of Narasimhavarman up to A.D. 720. In fact, a critical examination of the references reveal that there has been a mistake, in the dating and in the cataloguing of events under that date, which is quite understandable.

Though there is no means of ascertaining how long the voyage to Canton from Bhōja took place, it looks very incredible that it was anything like twenty-five to twenty-eight years from 692 to 720, even accounting for 'series of disasters', as the Chinese version states. As such the most reliable conclusion that can be made from the story of Vajrabodhi's departure accompanying the Pallava king's embassy is that in *circa* 691-2, the Pallava king Narasimhavarman was ruling at Kāñchī and had sent a royal embassy to China.

There is no question as to the correctness of the Chinese encyclopaedist in having catalogued that the embassy sent by the Pallava king Narasimhavarman reached Canton and presented its credentials to the Chinese emperor. But there is no means of verifying whether the Pallava king Narasimhavarman, who certainly sent the embassy to China in 692, was ever alive in 720. The very account seems to cast serious doubts and high improbability in this, though the encyclopaedist cannot naturally be questioned for having noted this event under 720 A.D. It appears, therefore, that there is a clear case of several years error in this particular Chinese date even if we allow ample time for all the series of disasters which the ship carrying Vajrabodhi and the Pallava embassy experienced in their voyage to Canton. All that is certain is that the Pallava did send an embassy to China in *circa* 692 A.D. and that the king of Kāñchī who sent it was ruling in 686-9 A.D. Even if one were to implicitly rely on the Chinese accounts, without seeking corroboration from other sources, one should say that Narasimha-

varman II was ruling from 686-9 to 720[8] at least, and there is no indication in these sources that he died in 720. But if one were to assert from the Chinese reference that Narasimhavarman ruled in 720, and at the same time state that that king began to rule in 700 A.D.[9] it should be disposed of as utterly unreliable, for that view disregards the very same Chinese source which clearly attests to the rule of that Pallava in *circa* 686-9, and thus gives the lie direct to the assumption that he ascended only in 700 A.D. nearly fifteen years later to his actual date of accession.

We may now pass on to a critical examination of the other Chinese references[10] to the embassies sent to China from the kingdom of India. Among these we find that (1) in 692, the king of the kingdom of South India was *Tche-leou-ki-pa-lo* (Chālukya Vallabha)[11], who sent his embassy; (2) in 710, the king of the kingdom of South India, also 'sent an embassy with tributes and products of the country', and the name of this king is not noted.[12] The king of the kingdom of South India referred to under the notice in 720[13] is called *Che-li-Na-lo-seng-kia* and he has been equated with Śrī Narasimha. In this reference there is the account given of a proposal to 'employ his war elephants and his cavalry to chastise the *Ta-che* (Arabs) as well as the *Tou-po* (Tibetans)' and his request for 'a name to be given to his army.' The Chinese emperor is said to have praised it greatly and named his army "the army which cherished virtue". Though the name of the king is not mentioned in the reference to the king of the kingdom of South India who sent an embassy in 710, we know that by the references to Vajrabodhi's visit to South India in 689, the king of the kingdom of South India was

8. K. A. N. Sastri: *A History of South India.* pp. 148, 163, Narasimhavarman, pp. 680-720.

9. N. Lakshminarayan Rao, *J. I. H.* Vol. XXX. p. 291; P. B. Desai, *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXIX. p. 92.

10. K. A. N. Sastri: *loc. cit.* pp. 24-5; p. 116.

11. *Ibid.* pp. 24-5. 12. *Ibid.* pp. 28, 116. 13. *Ibid.* p. 116.

none else than *Na-lo-seng-kia pou-to kia-mo*, *i.e.* Narasimhapotavarman and that he had sent an embassy. As such the very Chinese references to the embassies show that the embassy which the Pallava king had sent in 692 or thereabouts, reached Canton only in 710 and not before. We are therefore, constrained to infer from the Chinese references themselves that the embassy to that country, coming from the king of the kingdom of South India, Narasimhapotavarman, reached China in A.D. 710 and not in 720. This shows that the entry under 710 is much nearer to the actual date when the Pallava embassy reached China and that the entries made by the encyclopaedist under 720 should have been placed by him under 710 A.D.

On the mention of the Arabs and the Tibetans as the enemies of the Pallava kingdom Prof. K. A. N. Sastri, the editor of these *Foreign Notices*, remarks : 'separately or allied together, the Arabs and the Tibetans were more the enemies of China in this period than of any Indian State, least of all a South Indian State, and one can reasonably surmise, that it was the Chinese court which, being impressed by the political power of Narasimhavarman, in India, was anxious to enlist his support in its plans against the Tibetans'. And this shows that the varacity of the Chinese statement is greatly questionable. Rather there is a great degree of unreliability manifested by this foreign source, which is only a catalogue of dates and notices, compiled by an encyclopaedist of the eleventh century A.D. That many parts of the references are manifestly exaggeration is what is prominent from the statement that in A. D. 720 'an ambassador was sent to confer by brevet the title on the king of the kingdom of South India, *Che-li-Na-lo-seng-kia pao-to-pa-ma* (Sri Narasimhapotavarman)' as if there was any necessity for the Chinese king to confer the title on the South Indian king. This was merely based on the vanity of the Chinese that they were supreme. These accounts only reveal that a great amount of caution has to be exercised by historians in accepting these notices and dates as facts, and anyone with a judicious frame of mind will not stoop to utilise the date of these notices as basis for the building of the chronology of the reigns of the Indian kings.

These dates in particular should get confirmation from Indian and other sources, before they can be relied upon.

The references to Narasimhavarman, therefore, cannot be taken to show that 'the usual chronology of the reigns of the Pallava monarchs at the close of the seventh century and the beginning of the eighth is not as well founded as it is generally taken to be' and that 'it is possible that the reign of Narasimhavarman lasted longer and that of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla began later than is generally believed'.[14] If supposing an error in the Chinese date is demonstrated then this opinion will fall to the ground. There is no knowing how inaccurate could have been the eleventh century encyclopaedist of distant China on the events connected with Indian kings of the seventh and eighth centuries.

There is no ground to think that there was more than one embassy that was sent to China by the Pallava king Narasimhavarman. As Prof. Sastri, the editor of these notices, rightly observed,[15] the mission that accompanied Vajrabodhi, was doubtless the same as the one mentioned in the notices of the embassies sent by Narasimha. Though as we have pointed out above the Chinese date 710 is much nearer to the actual date when Vajrabodhi and the Pallava embassy which he accompanied reached Canton, yet it will be clear that even here the error in the Chinese dates is easily discernible. As shown above the Pallava king Narasimha sent his embassy along with Vajrabodhi in *circa* 692, and if we take it that they reached China the same year or the next, a clear error of about eighteen years is seen when the Chinese catalogue the date of the arrival of the Pallava embassy in A.D. 710.

Now we shall examine the reference under 692, to the arrival of the embassy from the king of the kingdom of South India, the Chālukya Vallabha. A critical examination of the records of the Western Chālukyas shows that Pulakēśin II's son, the great warrior Vikramāditya I (A.D. 654/5-680), who

14. K. A. N. Sastri : *loc. cit.* p. 17.

15. *Ibid.* p. 18.

conquered the successive Pallava kings Narasimha I, Mahēndravarman II and Paramēśvaravarman I, made himself the master of the South, and was fit enough to be called the king of the kingdom of South India. The references to the achievements of his son and grandson reveal their attempt to establish their supremacy over the king of the Northern India. They mention the conqest of the *Pālidhvaja* banner and other insignia of sovereignty by defeating a paramount king of Northern India. Vinayāditya was thus the supreme ruler of the North and South and was ruling in 680-96. As we know the rule of Vikramāditya ended in A.D. 680, and by which date he was greatly discomfited by the Pallava king Paramēśvarvarman, who razed his very capital and was hence called '*Raṇarasika-purōmardhana*', we may unhesitatingly say that the title of the Western Chālukya's supremacy as 'the king of the kingdom of South India', lasted only upto April of 674 A.D. as testified to by that king's military activities revealed in his famous Gadval copper plates. Immediately after this date, Vikramāditya and his powerful army consisting of lakhs of soldiers, were defeated in the battle of Peruvaḷanallūr, and the Western Chālukya king fled and his very capital was destroyed by the Pallava king. Charters reveal that Vikramāditya was popularly called Śrī Vallabha.[16] The Chinese reference to Chālukya Vallabha *(Tche-leou-ki-pa-lo)*, as king of the kingdom of South India, who sent an embassy to China can only be to Vikramāditya, who is styled 'the lord of the country between the three oceans' *(Tri samudra madhyāvartta bhuvana maṇḍalēśvara)*, and because his son and grandson are precluded from the applicability of the Chinese description, 'King of the kingdom of South India.' As such the reference given about this

---

16. The Gadval plates (April, 674 A.D.) calls him Anivārita Vikramāditya and Lord Śrī Vallabha who had acquired the title of Paramēśvara (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. X. p. 105). Surprising confirmation of this popular name is available from the Sinhalese chronicle Mahāvaṁsa (Ch. 47), when it states that in the reign of Dhatopatissa (659-667) Śrī Vallabha had come to war against the Pallavas, when Mānavamma assisted Narasimha in driving away the invader.

Chālukya's embassy under 692, must in reality have belonged to a date prior to 674 (April). After A.D. 674, even by the very Chinese references, the title 'King of the kingdom of South India' was applied to the Pallava king Narasimhavarman of the period 686-9 to 720. Thus we see that this Chinese reference reveals an error of nearly eighteen years (692 *minus* 674), with reference to the cataloguing of the date of the embassy from the Chālukya Vallabha.

Surprisingly it is the same period of error, that we demonstrated with reference to the Chinese date for the arrival of the Pallava embassy accompanying Vajrabodhi. As such it looks certain that there is a clear error of eighteen years at least in the Chinese dates of the period 692-720.

On the nature of these embassies, an author has rightly remarked "They did not proceed from a political system; they had still less the value of an *entente* between two countries. The missions, supposing that they were always authentic (and the Chinese emperors may have been, more than once, duped by adventurers), had no other reason than the vanity of a prince anxious to make his name known afar, or again religious zeal cleverly exploited by commercial interests. The history of Persian merchants who diligently followed Vajrabodhi is very significant. It is open to an author of edifying biographies to draw from this circumstance conclusions as to the prestige of the holy monk. The Persian traders knew very well that in following Vajrabodhi they gained the protection of the mission escort and a welcome reception in Buddhist countries. International commerce had quickly perceived the means whereby missionary politics could be turned to account". We may notice the vanity of the Chinese princes when the references mention that the embassies paid their homage and their tribute to them, as if these Chinese emperors were supreme over the Indian rulers.

And if we apply the error of not less than eighteen years,[17] discovered above in the Chinese dates pertaining to the same

---

17. The total error in this instance is nearly 28 years.

period to which Pallava Narasimha belonged, and which gets a simultaneous confirmation in the glaring discrepancy in the dates given in the Chinese notices, for the arrival in China of the Pallava embassy, we are assured of certain indications for the duration of the reign of that king of Kāñchī. It means, in the last resort, that Narasimha was ruling from *circa* A.D. 684 to 702 (720 *minus* 18).[18] This is in conformity with the revelations available from the Indian sources. As such the assertion of the epigraphists that Narasimha ascended in A.D. 700 and ruled up to A.D. 728-29 is completely wrong. It remains now to ascertain how long before A.D. 684 Narasimha ascended the throne of Kāñchī and how long after A. D. 702 he reigned.

Paramēśvaravarman II who succeeded Narasimhavarman II is described in the Kasakudi plates as "he who controlled the (evil) manifestations of the Kali (Age); who led the way of policy which had been prescribed by Dhiṣaṇa (Brihaspati); and who protected the world",[19] and in the Velūrpālayam plates as the chastiser of Kali and as one who governed according to the laws laid down by Manu.[20] His third year inscription on stone has been discovered from Tiruvadi.[21] That his rule ended in the normal way is pertinently revealed by the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ inscription when it says 'Paramēśvara-ppōttaraiyar' of the Pallava race which was descended from Brahma, having ascended Heaven, the kingdom was reduced to a state of anarchy (*rājyam utsannamāga*).[22] This evidently means that Paramēśvara died suddenly early in his reign, leaving no heir to succeed him.[23]

---

18. After a very careful study of the Chinese and Sinhalese sources, the famous French Savant Sylvain Levi, was convinced of the reign of Pallava king Narasimhavarman in about the year 700 A. D. *J. A.* 1900, May-June.
19. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 357. *v.* 26.
20. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 511. *v.* 24.
21. *A. R.* No. 56 of 1903.
22. *ivvagaiyē brahmanādiyāga varāniṉṟa Pallava vamśattul Paramēśvarappōttaraiyar svarggastarāvadu rājyam utsannamāga.*
23. The historical sculptures of the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ temple reveal no important event in this king's reign. See *Arch. Memoir. No. 63.* p. 32.

A synchronism is available from the Western Gaṅga records. The period of Śrīpurṣa Muttarasa is fixed well as A.D. 726-788. 'Nr. 35 says that he slew the valiant Kāduveṭṭi of Kāñchī, captured the Pallava state umbrella, and took away from him the title Pērmānaḍi, *which is always afterwards assumed by the Gaṅgas*, and is often used alone to designate them'.[24] That the Pallava who lost his life in this battle of Vilanda fighting against Gaṅga Śrīpuruṣa cannot be Paramēśvaravarman II, the predecessor of Nandivarman II, as assumed by Prof. K. A. N. Sastri,[25] will be patent from the sequel. The Vaikunṭha Perumāḷ temple inscriptions show clearly that Nandivarman Pallavamalla had the title Perumānaḍigaḷ. As such it would be clear that the Pallava whom the Gaṅga king slew cannot be taken to be any other than Nandivarman, and not his predecessor Paramēśvara, as the Gaṅgas '*always afterwards assumed*' the title. Thus the date when Śrīpuruṣa Muttarasa could possibly have achieved this is on or before his last year A. D. 788. This indicates that the date of death of Nandivarman was in or before A.D. 788, and since we know that that Pallava's highest regnal year is sixty-five, his date of accession could not have been later than A.D. 723 (788 *minus* 65).

That the Gaṅga had good reason to wage war against the Pallava is plain from the fact that Nandivarman II is stated to have defeated the Gaṅga and took possession of his jewel Ugrōdaya,[26] and this was in or prior to his fifty-eighth year. That the Gaṅga king did not assume the title '*Pērmānaḍi*' even in his Salem plates[27] dated in *Ś*. 693 (A.D. 771) wherein he is merely called Śrīpuruṣa *alias* Prithivi Koṅgaṇi Mahārāja, shows that this great achievement of his against the Pallava must be dated later than A.D. 771. This means that the death of Nandivarman Pallavamalla at his hands must have occurred

24. Rice : *Mysore and Coorg*. p. 39.
25. *History of Ceylon* (University of Ceylon Ed.). p. 279.
26. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 517. *v*. 6. '*dhatte Gaṅgād-apahṛitam—ugrōdaya-Kaustubham gaḷābharaṇam*'
27. *Ep. Ind*. Vol. XXVII. p. 150.

after A.D. 771, and shows that his date of accession must have taken place after A.D. 706 (771 *minus* 65).

There is one other line of investigation which narrows down the later limit to the date of accession of this Pallava. He was a supreme king when the '*Paramēśvarappadigam*' was sung by Tirumaṅgai Āḻwār. The work refers to his defeat of the Pāṇḍya king and the Vilvēli king at Nemmali, and other achievements, all of which are noted in the king's Kasakudi plates dated in his twenty-first regnal year. Since the Pallava is described in this work as having the '*kaḍuvāyppaṟai*', which, as is well known from the Western Chālukya records, Vikramāditya II captured by defeating that Pallava king, in or before 741-2 A.D.,[28] the date of composition of this work '*Paramēśvarappadigam*' by Tirumaṅgai Āḻwār was thus in or before 741-2 A.D. and after the twenty-first year of Nandivarman II. Therefore, the Pallava king's twenty-first year was in or before 740-1 A.D., and this shows that this king's date of accession was in or before 719-20 A.D. (740-1 *minus* 21).

From the foregoing it is plain that the date of accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, could not have been after A. D. 719-20, and must have taken place after A.D. 706 at the earliest. As we learn from the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ temple inscription that he succeeded to the Kāñchī throne a few months after the sudden death of Paramēśvaravarman II, the rule of that king, who was the son and successor of Narasimhavarman II, must have been over before. We have only the third year record of Paramēśvaravarman, and as he died suddenly leaving no heir to the throne, we may accept with others the supposition that his rule was short. As some time elapsed after his demise and before the selection of Nandivarman II as his successor by the ministers of State who went in search of an heir to the distant country of Hiraṇyavarman, during which period the records say there was restlessness in the realm, we may reasonably place the interval between the dates of accession of Paramēśvara-

28. *Ibid.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 126-7. Narwan plates of eighth regnal year. *Kaṭumukhavāditra samudragoshābhidhāna vādyavisēsha.*

varman II and Nandivarman II, which included the known three year rule, as five years at least. If this be granted, and there is nothing to say against this suggestion, then the date on which Narasimhavarman II, the father and predecessor of Paramēśvaravarman II, ceased to rule at Kāñchī, was not earlier to A.D. 701-2 (706 *minus* 5), not later than A.D. 713-14 (718-19 *minus* 5). This result, obtained from the Indian sources, is in complete agreement with the fact that by the corrected Chinese date, as has been shown above, he was ruling in 702 (720 *minus* 18 years correction). The reign of Paramēśvara was thus for a period of three to five years, after A. D. 701-2. It may be in 702-6 or in 714-18.

One thing that gets a certainty from the considerations noted above is that Narasimhavarman II, was dead by about 714 at the latest, if not by about 702, and was definitely not alive in 720. His period of rule was from any date prior to 684 A.D. Thus the contention of the epigraphists that Narasimhavarman ascended in 700 and ruled upto 728/9 is proved wholly incorrect, and stands contrary to the indications provided in the Indian sources and not borne by a critical examination of the Chinese reference to that Pallava king. It would also be plain from the above that as the date of accession of Nandivarman lay between the years A. D. 706 and 718/19, a contemporary reference to that king's predecessor, Paramēśvaravarman II, cannot be found in the Ulchala record which is dated in A.D. 730-1, *i.e.* several years after Nandivarman's accession.

APPENDIX*

" In the third month of the third year *t'ien-cheou* (692), the king of the kingdom of Eastern India *Mo-lo-pa-mo*, the king of the kingdom of Western India *Che-lo-ito* (*Śilāditya*), the king of the kingdom of South India *Tche-leou-k'i-pa-lo* (Chālukya Vallabha), the king of the kingdom of Northern India *Na-Na*, the king of the kingdom of Central India *Ti-mo-si-na*, and the king of the kingdom of *Kieou-tse* (Koutcha) *Yen-yao-pa* all came to render homage and make presents." (pp. 24-25)

* K. A. Nilakanta Sastri : *Foreign Notices of South India*, pp. 16 ff. and pp. 116-7.

"The kingdom of South India, among others sent an embassy with tribute and products of the country. In the reign of the Emperor *Joei-tsong*, in the ninth month of the first year (710), the kingdom of South India and the *Tou-po* (Tibetans), and in the tenth month, the kingdom of *Sie-yu* (Zabulistan) and of *Ki-pin* (Kapiśa) all sent ambassadors bringing in tribute and products of their countries. The *Kagan* "who respects the transformation", the *Tou-k'i-che* (Turgach) *Cheou-tchong*, ordered an ambassador to go and render homage." (p. 28)

I. "In the eighth year of *K'ai-yuen* (720), the king of the kingdom of South India *Che-li-Na-lo-seng-kia* (Śrī Narasimha), proposed to employ his war elephants and his cavalry to chastise the *Ta-che* (Arabs) as well as the *Tou-po* (Tibetans) and others. Moreover, he asked that a name be given to his army; the emperor praised it greatly and named his army 'the army which cherished virtue'." (p. 116)

II. "In the eighth year *K'ai-yuen* (720), the eighth month, the day *ting-tch'eou*, a decree was addressed to *tcheng-chow-men-hia* to inform him that the king of South India having sent from afar (an ambassador) to render homage and pay tribute, and this ambassador being due to return, he must look after him with the greatest care till his departure, and act in such a way that his desires might be fulfilled. This ambassador was therefore given a robe of flowered silk, a golden girdle, a purse with an emblem in the form of a fish and the seven objects; then he was sent away." (p. 116)

III. "In the eleventh month, an ambassador was sent to confer by brevet the title on the king of the kingdom of South India *Che-li-Na-lo-seng-k'ia pao-to-pa-mo* (Śrī Narasimhapotavarman). The texts marked I and II under year 720 are found again in *Kieou T'ang Chou* which adds the following: 'the ninth month, a king of South India *Che-li-Na-lo-seng-k'ia-to-pa* (Śrī Narasimhapotavarman) constructed a temple on account of the empire (*i.e.* of China); he addressed to the emperor a request asking from him an inscription giving a name to this temple; by decree, it was decided that the name should be, which causes

return to virtue (*Koei-hoa*), and it was presented to him (*i.e.* the emperor sent Narasimha a tablet with the inscription *Koei-hoa-se*, so that it might be placed on the front of the temple erected in India by Narasimha for the benefit of China)." (p. 117)

"The data given in these extracts from *Ts'o-fou-yuan-Konei, a great Chinese encyclopaedia compiled about 1013 A.D.* are confirmed by the following extract from *Ma-Twan-lin:*

"In the third of the years *keen-fung* (A.D. 667), the Five Indias (or five kingdoms of India) sent ambassadors to the court of the emperor. In the years *Kae-yuen* (A.D. 713 to 742) an ambassador from Central India proceeded three times as far as the extremity of Southern India, and came only once to offer birds of five colours that could talk. He applied for aid against the *Ta-she* (or Arabs) and the *Too-fan* (or Tibetans), offering to take the command of the auxiliary troops. The Emperor *Heuen-tsung* (who reigned from 713 to 756) conferred upon him the rank of general-in-chief. The Indian ambassadors said to him : 'the *Fan* (or Tibetan) barbarins are captivated only by clothes and equipments. Emperor! I must have a long silk embroidered robe, a leathern belt decorated with gold and a bag in the shape of a fish.' All these articles were ordered by the Emperor."—' Chavannes : Notes *additionnelles sur les Toukiue* (*Tures*) *Occidentaux*. *Toun Pao* II 5 : pp. 1-110 and *J.A.S.B.* VI. p. 71 for *Ma-Twan-lin*.' (p. 117)

THE PALLAVAS (THE PALLAVARGAL) A SURVEY *

Dr. T. K. Seshadri

The Pallavas between 1000 A.D. and the 13th Century

The inclusion of the two chiefs of the thirteenth century by the name of Kopperuṅjingadēvas I and II, in the Pallava genealogy is a point of dispute. The possibility of the Pallava genealogy, its head two centuries after its supposed end especially when, during the period of the oblivion, there was established the most powerful of the South Indian dynasties *viz.* the Colas and which also came to end is remote. One more point of difference between the Pallavas of the thirteenth century is that the charters of the Pallavas that ended at 1000 A. D. have, in addition to the Indo-Āryan, the Dravidian languages Tamil and Telugu. But the Pallavas of the thirteenth century have only Tamil charters.

The Kopperuṅjingadēvas would thus, have been the successors of the Pallavas in the Tamil area, but they might not have been the descendants of the Pallavas. A successor need not necessarily claim a descent from his predecessor. For instance, the Colas are the Imperial successors of the Pallavas in the South but they have nothing to do with the Pallava ancestry and similar might have been the case with the Kopperuṅjinga-dēvas. As the Kopperuṅjingadēvas were known more as the Kādavarāya chiefs, they can be taken to be a different dynasty, *viz.* the Kāḍavarāya dynasty. Venkatasubbier[51] has dealt with the chronology and the genealogy in such a way that the Kopperuñjingadēvas are the Pallavas and they are like the other chiefs who were reigning after the end of the main line *viz.* Vayirameghavarman, Chandrāditya, Satti, Skandaśiśya

* Continued from page 24.

51. Venkatasubbier. *loc. cit.* pp. VI ff.

and Gopaladeva though their "relationship to the main line is not known." He has included Kampavarman before Aparājita the last of the main line but Gopalan excludes Kampavarman from the main line as a king but treats him as a Pallava chief of the main line who came after Aparājita. It may be that, except Gopaladeva, the rest, other than the Kopperuṅjingadēvas, were of the main line but as chiefs and they were probably Kampavarman, Vayirameghavarman, Chandrāditya, Satti and Skandaśiśya. In the case of Gopaladeva, the Haldipur[52] inscription is explanatory.

Sathianathier[53] too establishes the untenability of the theory of two Peruñjiṅgās.

Thus, there does not seem to be any genealogical link and hence, chronological link between the Kopperuñjingadēvas and the imperial line of the Pallavas, which, it may not be correct to establish, beginning at the end of the second century, ended at *C.* 1000 A. D. and, thus, reigning for about eight centuries.

The Pallava Genealogy

There may be some answer to the Pallava chronology. But, the fixing of the Pallava genealogy in the historic perspective has defied every attempt. The names of the rulers of the historical dyanasty are so interwoven with the mythological ancestry that to have a clear view of the Pallava genealogy is rather impossible. What one can hope to do is to trace the genealogy of the later Pallavas *i.e.* the Pallavas of the non-Prākṛt and non-Sanskrit charters of the period 575–900 A.D. starting from Simhaviṣṇu and ending with Aparājita[54].

52. Lakshminarayan Rao, N. *E. I.* Vol. XXI, p. 178.

53. Sathianathier, R. '*The Kādavarāya Problem*' *in Dr. S. K. Aiyangar Commemoration Volume* pp. 212–215.

54. Here it may be pointed out that the author follows the chronology of the Simhaviṣṇu line as fixed by Prof. Venkataraman in his *loc. cit.* Part II. The author follows him for the third dynasty with minor amendments for the reign of Aparājita and Dantivarman. In line with Gopalan he has not made Kampavarman more than a chief unlike Venkatasubbier.

Gopalan[55] establishes the three different dynasties on the basis of the charters *viz.* (1) the dynasty of the Prākṛt charters, (2) the dynasty of the Sanskrit charters, and (3) the dynasty of the Sanskrit / Dravidian charters also called the Simhaviṣṇu dynasty. The epigraphic evidence for his genealogical table is derived form the Prākṛt - Mayidavolu, Hirahadahalli, and British Muséum and the Sanskrit Vayalūr, Velūrpalaiyam, Omagodu, Uruvapalli, Mangalur, Pikira Chendalur and Udayendiram, and the Tamil Kūṟam inscriptions.

Heras[56], who worked on the subject, later, differs form the general pattern of the theory of Gopalan[57] and arrives at two distinct features of the Pallava genealogy. The first is that the difference between the Pallavas of the Prākṛt charters and that of the Sanskrit charters is superficial and that both of them should be viewed as one group on the basis of the issue of the Sanskrit Darsi Plates by a king of the so-called Prākṛt period. The second feature is that the establishment of a dynasty among the Pallavas of the Sanskrit charters named after the king Vīrakurcha and of two more dynasties of the later charters named after Simhaviṣṇu and Nandivarman is ill-founded as they claim the common ancestry from Kalabhartr the first member of the Sanskrit dynasty.

Thus, Heras links the Prākṛt period with the Sanskrit period and the Sanskrit ancestry of Vīrakurcha with the later Sanskrit-Darvidian ancestry of Nandivarman and indirectly subscribes to Dubreuil's[58] view of the Pallava genealogy that the entire genealogy of the Pallavas, whether of the Prākṛt or the Sanskrit, or the later charters, is to be traced to Bappa, the supposed founder of the Pallavas of Kāñchī.

Scholars like Rayahaudhuri[59] and Sircar[60] recognise and uphold the establishment of a new dynasty ruling from the

55. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* pp. 33–113.
56. Heras, H. *The Pallava Genealogy.* pp. 24–27.
57. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.*
58. Dubreuil, G. J. *Pallavas.* pp. 72-73–the genealogical table.
59. Rayachaudhuri, H. C. *Political History of Ancient India.* p. 501.
60. Sircar, D. C. *History and Culture of the Indian People. The Classical Age.* p. 283.
The Successors of the Śātavāhans. pp. 169-174.

centre of the Nellore–Guntur region of the modern Āndhra Pradesh during the period of the Sanskrit charters, independent of the imperial Pallavas of Kāñchī. That there were two Pallava dynasties independent of each other at a stage of the Sanskrit period based on the regional approach to the issue of the charters and that the early charters were not issued from Kāñchī, the Capital, is not shared by all the scholars whose difference of opinion is based on the point that the places from where the charters were issued were not independent of the Pallava Dominion, but part and parcel of it. "There was only one dynasty that of Kāñchīpura," says Heras.

Though there may be one Pallava line from Bappa to Aparājita, it is better, for the sake of convenience and for a detailed survey of the notables, to classify the Pallava genealogy under the conventional heads of the Prākṛt, Sanskrit and later charters.

An Evaluation of the Pallava Kings

After having detailed out the problems connected with the Pallava chronology and genealogy, let us now proceed to study the careers of the famous kings of the dynasty. This would facilitate the understanding of the account of the swaying fortunes of the influence of the Pallavas on South Indian History and life.

Since the genealogy and the chronology of the Pallavas of the Pre-Simhaviṣṇu line is far from certainty, it would not be an obstacle in the approach of evaluating the role of the kings of the Prākṛt and Sanskrit records from a general angle.

II

The Kings of the Prākṛt Dynasty

Among the kings of the Prākṛt Dynasty, Bappa, Śivaskandavarman and Vijaya-Skandavarman are the renowned figures. The period of their reign was the third century A.D. Bappa[61], the earliest of the Prākṛt kings is the supposed founder

61. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* pp. 36-37.

of the Prākṛt family, and through it of the Pallavas of Kāñchī. Under him, the Pallava dominion had extended up to the Kṛṣṇā in the north and the Pālār in the south. Raychaudhuri[62], Gopalan[63] and Sircar[64] presume that, during his reign, there might have been two dynasties of the Pallavas independent of each other, *viz*. the Telugu dynasty[65] with Amarāvati as its capital and the Tamil dynasty with headquarters at Kāñchī.

Bappa was followed by the second king Śivaskandavarman.[66] His reign was one of political, administrative and cultural importance. He had pushed his northern frontier further up to the Godāvarī and the southern up to the South Pennār. Though Amarāvati was not the second capital as it was presumed to be so under his predecessor, it was a centre of Buddhist learning. He had developed, a sound administrative machinery on the line of the Mauryan System of Government. The territory was divided into *Viṣaya*, *Raṭṭa* and *Grāma*, the *Grāma* being the lowest unit. The official hierarchy was classified into Viṣayikas, Raṭṭikas (Rāṣṭrikas), and Desadikata (Desadhikṛtas). The advisers to the king were the *Amātya* and the *Rāhasyatikata*. Taxes were eighteen in number as known from *Attavasajati Parihara*. The guiding principles of his administration territorial, economic, or otherwise, were to be found in the Dharmaśāstras and the Arthaśāstras.

The credit of the issue of the earliest of the South Indian charters and also of the Prākṛt charters goes to Śivaskandavarman. His epithet '*Dharmamahārāja*' and his performance of the Aśvamēdha, Vājapeya and Agñiṣṭōma sacrifices, apart from revealing his extensive conquests, also bring to light the fact

---

62. Rayachaudhuri, H. C. *loc. cit.*
63. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* p. 34.
64. Sircar, D. C. *loc. cit.*
65. For some of the later kings of the so-called '*Telugu Pallavas*', please see S. S. Sastry's *Tirumalai Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphical Report*. Vol. I. Part II. pp. 125-129.
66. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* pp. 37-39.

that he had affinity for the traditional Brāhmanical ritual of an emperor.

The last king Vijaya-Skandavarman[67] whose identification is a point of dispute, is notable in that the earliest Pallava record, mentioning a royal gift to the temple being issued during his reign. Regarding the extent of his kingdom, it appears that he maintained the territorial acquisitions of his predecessor.

The Kings of the Sanskrit Records

In spite of the helping hand given by the Jain manuscript the *Lōkavibhāga*[68] in fixing the chronology of the members of the Sanskrit dynasty, what is finally arrived at is probable and it ranges between 325-500 A.D. Speaking of the above period, it is said that 'the political history of the Pallavas is almost a blank'.[69] The only exception to its not being a complete blank was the reign of Viṣṇugōpa who was better known amongst the probable seven members of the dynasty. The information on the chronological, genealogical and the other aspects of the Sanskrit dynasty is more meagre than that of the Prākṛt dynasty. At least one could get a rough idea of the individual achivements of the Prākṛt kings, especially Śivaskanda Varman but, even that we are deprived of with regard to the Sanskrit kings. Even about Viṣṇugōpa there is not direct information and what is available is that he might have been the same king referred to in the Allahabad Pillar inscriptions[70] of Samudragupta. Therefore, from the evidence on hand, there is no possibility of any reference to his achievements. As to his having been defeated by Samudragupta, there is no unanimity among scholars. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar upholds the '*digvijaya*' as depicted in the inscription, while Jayaswal and Dubreuil advocate a different view. Dubreuil is of the opinion that Samudragupta was forced to retreat by a confederacy of the Southern kings. "It is no

67. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* p. 39.
68. *M. A. R.* for 1909-10. p. 45.
69. Sastri, K. A. N. *loc. cit.* p. 99.
70. Fleet, J.F. *loc. cit.*

more than a new Alexander marching victoriously through South India" says Dubreuil. Jayaswal says that he did not go to Kāñchī very probably. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar calls the idea of a confederacy 'imaginary'. Of the three view points[71] discussed here, Jayaswal's seems to be the sound one.

The Pallavas of the later Charters also called the Sanskrit-Dravidian Charters or the Pallavas of the Simhaviṣṇu line

As the chronology and the genealogy of the Simhaviṣṇu dynasty is clear, it may be stated that the period of their reign ranged between the sixth and the later part of the tenth century. The only doubtful aspect of the chronology is the ending of the reign which has been discussed earlier. So also there is a tinge of doubt as to who the last king was. There were twelve kings from Simhaviṣṇu to Aparājita. The achievements of the major kings of this line may be summarised below.

Simhaviṣṇu[72] (555 to 600 A.D.)

He was not only the first member of the Imperial dynasty but the founder of a new line of the Pallavas called the Pallavas of the later Sanskrit/Tamil charters or, after himself, the Simhaviṣṇu dynasty. He extended his territory up to the Kāvēri basin by subduing the Colas, the Pāṇḍyas and the Kalabhrs, and laid the foundation of the dynasty on firm grounds. There is no information available about the northern extent of his dominion. He had the title Avanisimha. He seems to have been a Vaiṣṇavite. It was during the period of his reign that the Sanskrit poet Bharavi paid visit to Kāñchī.

Mahendravarman I[73] (600-630 A.D.)

He succeeded Simhaviṣṇu. He stands next only to his successor Narasimhavarman I, this greatest king of this dynasty.

---

71. Discussion in the foot-notes of p. 129 of Venkataraman's *Manual of Indian History*. p. I.

72. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit*. pp. 83-88.

73. *Ibid*. pp. 88-96.

Though he lost a part of the dominions to the Chālukyan Pulakēśin (Pulikēśin) II, he made it up by his southward extension upto Trichinopoly. No doubt, he failed as a General. But the failure in the political sphere was doubly compensated by his extra-ordinary success in the field of patronage to arts. He was a well-known poet and dramatist and patronised painting and music. *Matta-Vilāsa Prahasana*, a work written by himself, his title *Chitrakarappuli*,[74] particularly '*Vichitra-Chitra*' and his musical composition inscribed at Kudimiyāmalai bear testimony to this. To have been the first king to introduce rock-cut architecture in South-India was his contribution to sculpture and architecture. The rock-cut temples dedicated to Śiva and Viṣṇu at Vallam, Mahēndravādi and Dalavanūr bear witness to his love of art and devotion to the Brāhmanical trinity for whom he had caused the construction of a temple to Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva.

Narasimhavarman I[75] (630-68 A.D.)

As a worthier successor to his father, Narasimhavarman had regained what was lost by his father by sending Pulakēśin II out of Vatāpi and therefore had his epithet '*Vatāpikoṇḍa*'.[76] He was the greatest of the Pallavas and a formidable contemporary of the emperors of India of his times, having defeated the very person at whose hands emperor Harṣa was defeated. He could influence, by his naval expeditions even, the Sinhalese king Manavarman by making him dependent on his aid for his installation to the throne. He was the first of the South Indian kings to have maritime power, and in this respect, the Pallavas had preceded the Colas. He was the founder of the port city Mahamallapuram, called so after his title '*Mahāmalla*'. It is to his genius that the world-famous Pallava monuments at Mahābali-

74. Epigraphical Collection No. 82 of 1921 : The Conjeeveram Inscription of Mahēndravarman. *M.E R.* for 1909, p. 75: The Pallavaram Inscription of Mahendravikrama.

75. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* pp. 97-108.

76. Fleet, J.F. *I.A.* Vol. IX. p. 99. The Bādāmi Stone Inscription.

puram called the Seven Pagodas owe their construction. The noted Chinese Traveller Yuwang Chwang (Huien-Tsang) had called on this king at his court at Kāñchī.

Narasimhavarman II[77] (680-720 A.D.)

He was called 'Rājasiṁha'. He was the promoter of rock-cut temples. The Kailasanātha temple at Kānchī and the shore temple at Mahābalipuram bear testimony to his love of rock-cut architecture. The traits of his character are noticeable in his surnames '*Atyantakama*',[78] *Citrakarmuka*[79] and *Aparājita*[80]. Both the Sanskrit luminaries Daṇḍin and Bhāsa are said to have adorned the court of Rājasiṁha.

Nandivarman II (Pallavamalla)

The Vaikunṭhaperumāḷ temple inscriptions[81] indicate that he was *Popularly chosen*. He had cemented the possible break in the last of the lines of the Pallavas. He had built the Vaikunṭha-perumāḷ temple and the Muktēśvara temple at Kāñchī. He was a devotee of Viṣṇu. The king has been referred to by the eminent Vaiṣṇavite saint Tirumangi Āḻvar, a contemporary of his times, in his hymns on the deity of *Aṣṭabhuja* at Kāñchī. Politically, his was the least peaceful of the Pallava reign of the Simhaviṣṇu line. He had to face attacks from many quarters, *viz.* the Chālukya, the Rāṣṭrakūta, the Pāṇḍya and the Western Gaṅga dynasties. He had to yield to the Chālukya, Rāṣṭrakūta and the Pāṇḍya inroads towards the occupation of Kāñchī and the area around the capital. He could recover the area gradually, especially by means of an alliance with the Rāṣṭrakūta king Dantidurga by marrying the Rāṣṭrakūta princess Reva.

77. Gopalan, R. *loc. cit.* pp. 108-111.
78. Hultzsch, E. *S.I.I.* Vol. I. p. 13.
79. *Ibid.* p. 24
80. Epigraphical Collection No. 566 of 1912 and *M.E.R.* for 1913, paras 8 and 9.
81. *M. E. R.* for 1906, part II. pp. 62-63. Epigraphical Collection No. 37 of 1888.
    Aiyar, K. V. Subrahmanya. *E.I.* Vol. XVIII. p. 117.

Nandivarman III (845-866 A.D.)

His epithet '*Teḷḷāṟṟaṟinda*'[82] shows that it was adopted after his success at '*Tellaru*' where he defeated his Pāṇḍyan rival. The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* of his times deals with the notable events of his reign. He was a Śaivite and a promoter of the Tamil Literature. Perundevanar, the author of the Tamil work '*Bharatavenba*' was his contemporary.

The above sketch of the political careers of the main kings of the three groups of the Pallava dynasty should be sufficient to indicate that they were a power to reckon with so far as the South is concerned. Besides the political influence, several of the kings left their impress in other walks of South Indian Culture as well. It would be better, therefore, to evaluate their influence.

(*To be continued*)

82. Epigrapical Collection No. 12 of 1895.
Venkayya, Y. *M.C.C. Magazine*, Vol. VIII. p. 102.

HAIDAR NĀMA OR BAKHAIR*

By Nallappa

Edited by T. T. SHARMAN

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಚಂದಾಸಾಬರನಂತೂ ಹೊಡದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾಯಿತು. ಕಿಲ್ಲೆ ಠಾಣೆ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಡೂಯಂಬದಾಗಿ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಮಮ್ಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅವಸ್ಯಾ ಅದೇ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸರದಾರರನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕರದುಕೊಂಡು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜನದಿಂದ ಖಾಸಾ ನೀವೇ ಕಿಲ್ಲೇ ವಳಗೆ ಬಂದು ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಠಾಣೆ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಮಹಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹ್ಸಿದರಿಂದ ಅದೇ ಮೇರೆ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಮಿತಜನ ಸಹಾ ಹೊರಟು ಬೀದೀ ಹುಲಿಮುಖದ ವಂದು ಬಾಗಿಲ ದಾಟಿ ಮತ್ತೂ ವಳಹೋಗುವ ವ್ಯಾಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡ ನಿಂತು ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲಾ. ಯಿದೆಲ್ಲ ಪಿತೂರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರವಾಗಿ ಯಿದೆ ಯಂದು ಅರಶಿನವರ ಹಿಂದಿರುಗಿಶಿ ತರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಮುಂದಣ ಬಾಗಿಲುಗಳಂನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೋಟೆಮೇಲಣಿಂದಾ ಗುಂಡುಗಳ ಹೊಡದಕಾರಣ ಯಿಾ ಸುದ್ದಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಮಹಮ್ಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರ ತಾಯಿಾ ತಂನ ಮಗಂನ ತಪ್ಪು ಹಿಡಿದು ಅರಶಿನವರಿಂದಾ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಣೋಪಕಾರವಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾಉೂ ಸ್ವಾಮಿದ್ರೋಹ ಮಿತ್ರದ್ರೋಹ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ತಿಳೀಹೇಳಿ ಗುಂಡುಗಳ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಶಿ ಹೊರಬಾಗಿಲ ತೆಗಶಿಕೊಟು ಅರಶಿನವರನ ಹೊರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಕೋಟೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ತೋಫಿನಯಶಿಗೆ ಹೊರಗಾಗಿ ಅರಶಿನವರ ದಂಡು ಯಿಳಿಕೊಂಡು ತಂಮ್ಮ ಫವುಜಿನ ಸರದಾರರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಂದಿ ಕುದುರೆ ಬಾರು ಜಮಾಯಿಸುವಂತ್ತೆ ಹ್ಯಾರಳವಾಗಿ ಹಣಕಾಸುಗಳ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮುರಾರಿ ರಾಯರಿಗೆ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ೫೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಮ್ಯಾರೆಗೆ ಅವರ ಫವುಜಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟು ಯಿಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ಮುತ್ತಿಗೆಮಾಡಿದರು.

ಆವರಿಗೆ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಮೊದಲು ತಮಗೆ ನಾಜರ ಜಂಗರ ದಂಡು ಮುಳುಗಿದಾಗ ಶಿಕ್ಕಿದ ಖಜಾನೆಬಲದಿಂದ ಕುದುರೆಮಂದಿ ಸಹಾ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಜಮೆಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾಗಿ ಜಮೆಮಾಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಯಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತಾ ಮೊದಲು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ಸೈದ ಮಖದೂಮರ ತಂಗಿಗೆ ವಾಯು ರೋಗದಿಂದ ಕಾಲುಗಳು ಹೋದಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ ನಾಜರಜಂಗರ ಹಮರಹಾ ಹೋಗಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ವ್ಯಾಳೇಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾದಷಾಹಿ ಸಂನದಿನಮೇಲೆ ಗುರುಂಕೊಂಡೆ ಕಿಲ್ಲೆ ದಾರಿ ಕೆಲವು ದಿವಸಾಮಾಡಿ ಯಿದ್ದವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮಲಕಯಿಸಲಾಂಖಾನರ

* continued from page 34

ಆಶ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರ್ಕಾಡಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ಸಬಬು ಮಲಕ್ಕೈಸಲಾಂಖಾನರ ಮಾರೀಫತಿನಿಂದ ಆ ಗುರುಂಕೊಂಡೆ ಮೀರಲ್ಲಿರಜಾಸಾಬರ ಸಹೋದರಿಯಂನ್ನು ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿ ದೇವಂಡನಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಬಾಗಿಲು ಮಾಡಿ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿ ಹಮರಹಾ ತಾವೂ ಯಿದ್ದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಯಿಾತನ ಬಹಳ ಸರಫರಾಜು ಮಾಡಿ ಬಹದರನೆಂದು ಕಿತಾಬುಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮಂದಿ ಕುದುರೆ ಜಮಾಯಿಸುವಂತ್ತೆ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಯಿಾತನು ಬಹಳ ಸರಫರಾಜುಮಾಡಿ ಪೂರ್ವದ ಶಿಲಕು ಸಹಾ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಕುದರೆ ೨೦೦೦ ವಾಗಿ ವಗ್ಯೆರೆ ಅಹಷಾಂ ೪೦೦೦ ಬಾರು ೪೦೦೦ ಸಹಾ ಜಮಾಯಿಸಿ ಕೋಟೇಸುತ್ತ ಯರಡು ಗಾವುದ ಪರಿಯಂತ್ರ ಜಮಾಯಿಸಿ ದವುಡುತ್ತಾ ಚಂದಾಸಾಬರ ದಂಡು ಮುಳುಗಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡಾವು ಶಿಕ್ಕಿದ ಬಾರು ತುಪಾಕಿಗಳನ್ನು ದರ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಮ್ಯಾರೆಗೆ ಕ್ರಯಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಜವಾನರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಹಳ ಝುರಮತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ವಂದು ಪಡಿಕಾಳು ಆದರೂ ಕೋಟೆವಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗದಂತ್ತೆ ರಸ್ತು ಬಂದ್ದುಮಾಡಿ ಬಹು ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದರು.

ಯಿಾ ಮಥ್ಯೆ ಚಂದಾಸಾಬರು ಯಿರುವಾಗ್ಯೆ ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣದಿಂದ ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ರಸ್ತು ತರತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಮಹಂಮದ ಅಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರ ಬಳಿಯಣಿಂದ ಮೇಸ್ತ್ರರ ಕೇಲೀಸಯಂಬ ಯಿಂಗರೇಜ ಸರದಾರನ ಹಮರಹಾ ರಸ್ತುಸಂರಕ್ಷಣೆ ನಿಮಿತ್ಯ ಪಟ್ಣದ ಫವುಜಿನಿಂದ ೩೦೦೦ ಸವಾರ್ರು ಸಹಾ ಬರಕ್ಕಿ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯನ ತೈನಮಾಡಿ ಕುಳುಹ್ಸಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ದೋಸ್ತಿಯಿಂದಾ ಆ ಮೇಸ್ತರ ಕೇಲೀಸನ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಆತನ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರಾ ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೋರಂದರ ಪಿಕ್ಕಟಸಾಹೆಬರ ಹೆಸರ ಸಂನದ ತರಿಶಿ ತಿರಚನಾಪಳಿ ಕೈವಶಾಮಾಡಿಕೋಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರಶಿನವರು ಯೋಚಿಸಿ ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯರ ಕಳುಹ್ಸಿ ಯಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಾ ವರ್ತಮಾನಾ ತಿಳಿದು ಮಹಂಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನನು ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯರನ ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣದಲ್ಲೆ ಕೈದುಮಾಡಿಸಲಾಗಿ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ವರ್ಷ ಪರ್ಯಂತರ ರಾಯರು ಕೈದಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಪಿಕ್ಕಟಸಾಬರು ಯಿಲಾಯತ್ತಿಗೆ ಹೋಗೂವಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಯರನ ಬಿಟರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಕೋಟೆವಳಗೆ ತಿಂನುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಳು ಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಹಂಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನನು ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಲಂಚಾಹಾಕಿ ಆತನ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರ ಅರಶಿನವರ ಬಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕವುಲುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ವಿವರ. ತಾನೂ ಚಂನ್ನಪಟಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದಾ ಯರಡು ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಟೆ ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಯಿಂಗ್ರೇಜೀ ಗವುನರ ಸಂನದು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಾಗಿಯು ಆಪರಿಯಂತ್ರ ಕೋಟೆವಳಕ್ಕೆ ವಬ್ಬ ಕಿಲ್ಲೆದಾರ ೨೦೦ ಜನ ಪೇದೇರು ಸಹಾ ಅರಶಿನವರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದಾ ಬಂದು ಠಾಣೆ ಯಿರುವಹಾಗೂ ಯಿಾ ಯರಡು ತಿಂಗಳು ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ಅಮುಖಾಸು ರಸ್ತು ಬರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೂ ಕರಾರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅರಶಿನವರ ಭೇಟಿಗೆ ತಾನು ಬಂದನು.

ಆವರಿಗೂ ಅರಶಿನವರ ಕಡೆ ದರೋಬಸ್ತು ಸರದಾರರು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಸಹಾ ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಬೋದಿಸ್ತ ವಿವರ. ಯಿವರಿಗೂ ಯಷ್ಟು ಉಪಕೃತೀ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಮಹಂಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ನಿಮಿಗೆ ಮೋಸವೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬರುತಾನಾಗಿ ಯಿಾಗ ಯಿವನಿಗೆ ಸಮಯ ತಪ್ಪಿ ನಾಲ್ವತ್ತು ಮೂವತ್ತು ಜನದಿಂದ ನಿಂಮ್ಮ ಭೇಟಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಯಿರುವವನ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಯಿಲ್ಲೆ ಅಟಕಾಯಿಸಿ ಕೋಟೆವಳಗಣ ಠಾಣೆ ಹೊರತೆಗಶಿ ನಂಮ್ಮ ಠಾಣೇಯಂನ್ನು ಕಿಲ್ಲೆವಳಗೆ ಬಲಕಾಯಿಸಿ ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ನಿಂಮ್ಮ ಚಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಯಿವಂನ್ನ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೂ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಯಿಾ ಸಮಯ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಯಿವನು ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣ ಶೇರಿದ ಬಳಿಕ ಪುನಹಾ ಯಿಾ ಕಿಲ್ಲೆ ನಂಮ್ಮ ಕೈವಶವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬಹುತರವಾಗಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು.

ಯಿಾ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಆರಶಿನವರು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಿವರ. ನಾವಂತ್ತೂ ಯಂದಿಗೂ ಕವಲುಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕದಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಅವನ ದ್ರೋಹ ಅವಂನೇ ತಿಂದೀತು. ಯಿದಲ್ಲದೆ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು. ಅವರ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರ ಆದ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಮಹಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಂನ್ನುಮೇಲೆ ತಪ್ಪಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು.

ತರುವಾಯ ಮಹಂಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನನು ಮಿತ ಜನದಿಂದ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರ ಹಮರಹಾ ಬಂದು ಅರಶಿನವರ ಭೇಟಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಟೆವಳಕ್ಕೆ ಕತ್ತಿ ಗೋಪಾಲರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರನೂ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಚಂನಪ್ಪಯ್ಯನವರನೂ ೨೦೦ ಜನ ಅಹಷಾಂ ಪ್ಯಾದೇರನ ಸಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೋಟೆವಳಗೆ ಯಿಂಗರೇಜು ಬಹದರವರ ಠಾಣೆ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಮಹಂಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನನು ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಣಕೆ ಹೊರಟುಹೋದನು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಕೆ ದೇವರ ದರುಶನಕೆ ಬಂದು ಫವುಜು ಆ ದೇವಸ್ತಾನದ ದೊಡ್ಡಪೌಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಳಿದ ರಾತ್ರೆ ಬೆಳಗಿನರ್ಝಾವಕೆ ತಿರಚನಾಪಳಿ ಕೋಟೆ ವಳಗಣಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಬಾರು ಕೆಲವು ಸೋಜರರು ಸಹಾ ನಾಲ್ಕು ತೋಪುಗಳ ಯಳಕೊಂಡು ಹೊರಗೆ ಬಂದು ಅಂಮಾ ಮಂಟಪದಮೇಲೆ ತೋಪುಗಳ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಅರಶಿನವರ ದಂಡಿಗೆ ಗುಂಡುಗಳ ಹೊಡದರಾಗಿ ಆವಾಗಾ ಹರೀಶಿಂಗ ಜಮಾದಾರನು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರರೂ ಸಹಾ ಕುದುರೆ ಫವುಜು ಚಲಾಯಿಶಿ ಸದರಿ ಸೋಜರರು ಬಾರು ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಕ್ಕು ಹೊಡದು ಖತಲುಮಾಡಿ ತೋಫುಗಳ ಕಸುಕೊಂಡರು.

ಆವಾಗಾ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯನ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಭುಜಂಗರಾಯ ಸಾಕುಮಗ ಬಾಳಾಜೀರಾಯ ಬಕಷೀ ಗೋವಿಂದರಾಯ ವಗೈರೆ ಠಾರಾದರು. ಆ ವ್ಯಾಳೆ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯನ್ನು ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಬಲವಂತ್ತದಿಂದಾ ಯಿಾ ತೋಫುಗಳ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡನಾಗಿ ಆ ಪೈಕಿ ವಿಷ್ಣುಚಕ್ರವೆಂಬ ಗೋಪಾಲಚಕ್ರದ ಬಂಣದ ಫೂಚು ತೋಫು ಹೋಯಿತೆಂಬ ಸಂಕಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹದರರೂ ಯಿಾ ತೋಫಿನ ಸಂಗಡ ನಿಂನನೂ ನಿನ್ನ ಕುಟುಂಬ ಮಕ್ಕಳನೂ ನಿಂನ್ನ ಗುತ್ತಿದುರ್ಗ ಸಹಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ

ಮರೆಯಬ್ಯಾಡವೆಂದು ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರಿಗೆ ವದಲಿಶಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ದ್ವೇಷಾ ಮನಶ್ಶಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಟ್ಟರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಕೋಟೆವಳಗೆ ಕತ್ತಿ ಗೋಪಾಲರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರು ಕೈದುಮಾಡಿ ಕೋಟೆಯಿಂದಾ ಅರಶಿನವರ ದಂಡಿನಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡುಗಳು ಹೊಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದ ಕಾರಣ ಪುನಹಾ ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ರಸ್ತು ಬಂದುಮಾಡಿ ಜಗಳವಾಗುತ್ತಾಯಿತ್ತು.

ತರುವಾಯ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರು ಪುಲಚೆರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯಾಣವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಫರಾಷೀ ಸರನ ತಮಗೆ ಕುಮುಕು ತರುವಂತ್ತೆ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಯಿವರ ಸಂಗಡ ವಕೀಲ ವೆಂಕಟನಾರಾಯಣಪ್ಪನ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ್ದಾ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮುರಾರಿರಾಯನು ತಾತಾನಿರಾಮಾಡಲಾಗಿ ವೆಂಕಟನಾರಣಪ್ಪನೂ ತಂನ ಸ್ವಬುದ್ಧಿಯಿಂದಾ ಸಾಹಸಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಪುಲಚೆರಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಂಗಿಯವರಂನ್ನು ಕುಮುಕು ತಂದದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಅವರು ವಂದು ದಿವಸಾ ರಾತ್ರೆ ಕಸ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ಹಲ್ಲಾಯೇರಿ ಅಲಂಗದಮೇಲೆ ಯೇರುತ್ತಲೆ ವಳಗಿನವರು ಕಂಡು ಹುಷಾರಾಗಿ ಜಮಾಯಿಸಿ ನಿಂತದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸದೆ ಕವುಲುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಫರಾಷೀನರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜನ ಆದ ಸಬಬು ಹೊರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಪುಲಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹೊರಟುಹೋದರು. ತರುವಾಯಾ ಯಿಾ ಮೊಹಿಂಮು ಮೂರು ವರುಷ ಪಟ್ಟದ ಖಜಾನೆ ಹಣವೆಲ್ಲಾ ವೆಚ್ಚವಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಫವುಜಿಗೆ ಕರಾರುಬಾಕಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ದಂಗೆ ಧರಣೆ ಆಗಿ ಯಿರುವುದಂನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಚಂನ್ನಪಟ್ಟದಿಂದ ಮಹಮದಲ್ಲಿಖಾನನು ಗೋಪ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅರಶಿನವರ ದಂಡಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಸರದಾರರಿಗೆ ಲಂಚಾಹಾಕಿ ಕ್ರಿತ್ತಿಮಂದಿದಾ ಫವುಜಿನವರು ಅರಶಿನವರಮೇಲೆ ತಗಾದಿ ಕುಳಿತರು.

ಯಿಾ ವರ್ತಮಾನವಂನ್ನು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರವರು ತಿಳಿದು ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಗೋಪ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಶಿದರಿಂದಾ ಫವುಜಿನವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮೂರು ದಿವಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರವಾಶಿ ಸಂಬಳಾ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಕರಾರುಮಾಡಿ ಡಂಗೆ ಯೆಬ್ಬಿಸಿ ಮರು ದಿವಸಾ ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರೂ ಸವಾರಿ ಹೊರಟು ಶ್ರೀರಂಗ ಜಂಬುಕೇಶ್ವರಸ್ವಾಮಿಾ ದರುಶನಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವಾಗ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಬಂದು ಕಂಡೂ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಫವುಜಿನಲ್ಲೆ ಅರಶಿನವರನ ಯಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರಾಗಿ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಫವುಜೆಲ್ಲಾ ಯೇನು ಕಾರಣ ಯಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರಿ ಯೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಕರಾರು ಬಾಕಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಟಕಾಯಿಸಿ ಯಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಯಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಬಹದರರು ಜಬಾಬು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿ ಯಲ್ಲಾರು ಸಮರ ಸಂನಾಹರಾಗಿ ಬಹದರರ ಫವುಜು ತಯಾರಾಗುತ್ತಲೆ ಕಂಡು ಯಲ್ಲರೂ ಹಿಂಜೆಗ್ಗಿ ಮಧ್ಯಸ್ತವಾಗಿ ಪಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಯಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೊರಡುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಹದರರನ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸ್ವಸ್ತವಾದರು.

ಆವರಿಗೆ ಶಕೆ ೧೬೭೭ ನೆ ಯುವ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಿಂದಾ ಸಲಾಬತಜಂಗರು ಫರಾಷೀ ಸಮೂಸಾ ಭೂಸೀ ಫವುಜು ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ

ಹಾಗಲವಾಡಿ ಕುಣಿಗಿಲು ಸಹಾ ಲುಟಾಯಿಸಿ ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಬಳಿ ಯಿಳಿದು ತೋಫುಗಳ ಷುರುಮಾಡಿದ ಸುದ್ದಿ ಬಂದಕಾರಣ ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿ ಬಳಿಯಣ ಫವುಜು ಹೊರಟು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಮಾರ್ಗವಾಗಿ ಸಾಗಿ ಬಂತು.

ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಳಗಣ ಶೀಮೆ ಭಾರಿ ಅಮುಲುಮಾಡುವ ನಾಮಕಲ್ಲು ರಾಮಾರಡ್ಡಿ ಮುಂತಾದವರನ ಭೇಟಿಗೆ ಕರಶಿ ಅವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಹುತರ ಸಂನ್ಮಾನಾ ಮಾಡಿಶೀ ಐದಾರು ಲಕ್ಷ ವರಹಾ ಪರ್ಯಂತ್ರ ಅವರಿಂದ ಅರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ನಜರು ಕೊಡಿಶಿ ಆ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಫವುಜಿನವರ ತಲಬು ಬಾಕಿ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಕೆಲವೂ ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹರದನಹಳ್ಳಿ ನಂಜನಗೂಡು ಬಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಬಂದು ದಾಖಲಾದರು.

ಅಷ್ಟರಲ್ಲೇ ೫೬೦೦೦೦೦ ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಮೇಲೆ ಸಲಾಬತ್ತುಜಂಗರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಾ ಚುಕಾಯಿಸಿ ಖಜಾನೆ ಹಣ ಜವಾಹಿರು ದೇವಸ್ತಾನದ ವಡವೆಗಳು ಮುಂತ್ತಾಗಿ ವಂದು ಹಿಸ್ಸೆ ಸರಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಿಂತ ಯರಡು ಹಿಸ್ಸೆ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಹುಕಾರರ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆರನ ವೋಲು ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹಣ ತೀರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆರು ಅಲ್ಲೆ ಸತ್ತರು. ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆರು ವೋಡಿಹೋದರು. ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರು ನಂಜನಗೂಡು ಬಳಿ ಕೆಲವು ಫವುಜು ಭರತರ್ಫುಮಾಡಿ ದಿಂಡಗಲ್ಲು ಕಡೆ ಷರಾರತಿ ಪಾಳ್ಯೆಗಾರರ ತಂಬೀ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನ ಬಹದರವರಿಗೆ ಮೊಕರೂರು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಣವೇ ಕೆಳಗಣ ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲ ಯಿರೋಡು ಶಂಖಗಿರಿ ಶೀಮೆಮೇಲೆ ೩೦೦೦೦೦ ವರಹಾ ಗೋಪಾಲೀ ತನಖೆ ಬರಶಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ದಿಂಡಿಗಲ್ಲು ಕಡೆಗೆ ಬಹದರರನ ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಯೂವ ಸಂವತ್ಸರ ಶ್ರಾವಣದಲ್ಲು ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಪಟ್ಟಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು.

ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರವರು ದಿಂಡಗಲ್ಲು ಬಳಿ ದಂಡು ಯಿಳಿದೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪಳನೀ ವಿರೂಪಾಕ್ಷ ಮಿಳಿಮಿರಂಗಿ ಅಂಮಿನಾಯಕ ಅಪ್ಪೆನಾಯಕ ವಗೈರೆ ಪಾಳ್ಳೆಗಾರ್ರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೊಡದು ಹಣಕಾಸುಗಳ ತೆಗದು ಮತ್ತು ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಜರಾನೆ ಗಳ ಮಾಡಿ ೨೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪರ್ಯಂತರ ಜಮಾಯಿಸಿ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ವಕೀಲ ಖಂಡೇರಾಯನ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ತರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹಣ ಫವುಜು ಸಹಾ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿಯಿಂದಾ ಕಾರೇಗಾರರ ಕರಶಿ ಹೊಸ್ತಾಗಿ ಪಂಚದಶೀ ತೋಪುಗಳಂನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಯಿದ್ದರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಶಕೆ ೧೬೭೮ ನೆ ಧಾತು ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲು ಖಜಾನೆ ಹಣ ಸವದ ಸಬಬು ಮನಸ್ತಾಪಗಳೂ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಕರ್ತರು ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಿಷ್ಣರಾಜ ವಡೆಯರವರು ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರೂ ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತು ದಳವಾಯಿ ದೇವರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರು ಮಾತ್ರಾ ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲಕೆ ಬಂದು ನಿಂತರು. ಆವಾಗಾ ಕಲ್ಲಿಕೋಟೆಯವರಿಗೂ ಪಾಲಘಾಟೀ ತಲಚೇರಿಯವರಿಗೂ ಕಲಹಾ ಬಿದ್ದ ವರ್ತಮಾನ ಕೇಳಿ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರರೂ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಭಾವಮೈದ ಸೈದ

ಮುಕದೂಮುರನೂ ದಿವಾನ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯರನೂ ಸಹಾ ಕುದುರೆ ೨೦೦೦ ಬಾರು ೪೦೦೦ ಸಹಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕಲ್ಲಿಕೋಟೆ ಕೊಚ್ಚಿ ಕಡೆ ಕೆಲಊ ಶೀಮೆ ಲೂಟಿಸಿ ಠಾಣ್ಯಹಾಕಿ ಪಾಲಘಾಟ ತಲಚೇರಿ ಖಂಡಣೆ ಚುಕಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಲ್ಲಿಕೋಟೆ ನಾಯಿಮಾರರು ೧೨೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಪಗದೀ ವಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ವಳಗೆ ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲಕೆ ದಳವಾಯಿ ದೇವರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಸಂದಾನಾ ಹಚ್ಚಿಸಿ ಸದರಹೂ ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಿಮಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಫವುಜು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕರಶಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದೂ ಯಂಬದಾಗಿ ದಳವಾಯಿ ವುತ್ರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದ ರಿಂದ್ದಾ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಫವುಜಿನ ಖರ್ಚು ಹ್ಯಾರಳ ಮುಟಿಯಿಥೆ ಯಂದು ಬಹದರರು ಜಬಾಬು ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿ ಬಹದರವರ ಫೌಜು ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ೩೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ವಾಡೆಬಾಗಿಲ ರಂಗಂಣನ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರವಂನ್ನು ಬಹದರವರಿಗೆ ಬರಶಿಕೊಟು ಅವರ ಫವುಜು ಹಿಂದಕೆ ತಿರುಗಿಶಿ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಹರಿಶಿಂಗ ಜಮೆದಾರ್ರಂನ್ನು ನಡಕರೆ ರಾಮಂಣನ ಮಗ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಯಂನ್ನು ಹರಿಶಿಂಗನರಿ ಸಾಲೆ ೫೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ಸಹ ಸದರಿ ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರು.

ಯಿಾ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಕಣಿವೆ ಕೆಳಗಣ ಶಂಖಗಿರಿ ಹಿರೋಡು ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲದಿಂದ ಬಹದರರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ತನಖೆ ಹಣವಂನ್ನು ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲದಲ್ಲಿ ದಳವಾಯಿ ದೇವ ರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರು ತರಿಶಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಯಿರಲಾಗಿ ಯಿಾ ನಿಮಿತ್ಯ ಜಬಾಬು ಸವಾಲು ಮಾಡುವ ನಿಮಿತ್ಯಾ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ದಿಂಡಿಗಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಪಟ್ಟಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು.

ಆವಾಗಾ ಮೊದಲು ಹೊಸೂರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ವೆಂಕಟಪತೈಯ್ಯನ ಕರತರಿಶಿ ಚಂನ್ನಪೈಯ್ಯನ ಬದಲುಮಾಡಿ ವೆಂಕಟಪತೈಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯಾ ಕೊಟರು.

ಶಕೆ ೧೬೭೮ ನೆ ಧಾತು ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲೂ ಪುನ್ನೆದಿಂದ ಬಾಜೀರಾಯರ ಮಗ ಬಾಳಾಜೀರಾವು, ನಾನಾಸಾಹೇಬರು, ಯಿವರ ತಂಮ್ಮ ರಘುನಾಥರಾಯರು, ನಾನಾರಾಯರ ಮಗ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸರಾಯರು, ಮಾಧವರಾಯರು, ನಾರಾಯಣ ರಾಯರು, ನಾನಾರಾಯರ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ ಮಹಾಜೀಪಂತರ ಮಗ ಸದಾಶಿವರಾಯರು, ಬಾಹೂ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಸಹ ೧೦೦೦೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ೧೦೦೦೦೦ ಪಾಯಿದಳದಿಂದ ಪಟ್ಣದ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಯಿಳಿದೂ ಮೊಹರ್ಚೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಲಡಾಯಾಗಿ ಬೀನೀ ಯಸ್ನಾಜೀ ಪಂತರು ಬಲವಂತರಾಯರು ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಣದ ಕೋಟೆವಳಗೆ ಬಂದು ಮಧ್ಯಸ್ತವಾಗಿ ೩೨೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಾ ಖಂಡಣೆಯಾಗಿ ೬೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಜವಾಹಿರಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಸಂದಾಯುವಾಗಿ ಬಾಕಿ ೨೬,೦೦೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಶೀಮೆ ವೋಲುಯಿಟ್ಟರು. ವಿವರ

ನಾಗಮಂಗಲ	೧	ಚನ್ನರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಣ	೧	ಬೇಲೂರು	೧
ಕಡಬ	೧	ಹೊಂನವಳ್ಳಿ	೧	ಚಿಕ್ಕನಾಯ್ಕನಳ್ಳಿ	೧

ಬಾಣಾವರ	೧	ಕಡೂರು	೧	ಹಾರನಹಳಿ	೧
ಕಿಕ್ಕೇರಿ	೧	ತುರುವೆಕೆರೆ	೧	ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ	೧
ಕಂದಿಕೆರೆ	೧				

ಈ ಹದಿಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೋಕು ಸಹಾ ವೋಲು ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಹಣ ತೀರಿದ ಬಳಿಕ ತಾಲ್ಲೋಕುಗಳ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡುವದಾಗಿ ಕರಾರು ಮಾಡಿ ನಾನಾರಾಯರು ಫವುಜು ಸಹಾ ಪುನ್ನೆಗೆ ಹೊರಟುಹೋದರು. ಯಿವರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದಾ ರಾಘೋ ಬಾಬಾಜಿ ಯಂಬ ಸರದಾರ ೬೦೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ಸಹ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಶಖೆ ೧೬೭೯ ನೆ ಯಿಶ್ವರ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲೂ ಆವರವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಜಗಳವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಯಿತ್ತು. ದಿಂಡುಗಲ್ಲಿಂದಾ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರರೂ ಬಂದು ಪಟ್ಣದ ಬಳಿ ಮರಾಟೇರು ಮೊಹರ್ಚೆ ಹಾಕಿಯಿದ್ದ ಸ್ಥಳಾ ನೋಡಿ ಆವ್ಯಾಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಮಗ ಕರಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಯಿತ್ತು. ಬಂದರೆ ತಮಾಸೆ ನೋಡುವಿರೀ ಯೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿ ಮೊದಲಿನ ತನಿಖೆ ಹಣ ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ತಂನ್ನ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ತಾಕೀತಿಗಳಂನ್ನು ಬರಶಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ದಳವಾಯಿ ದೇವರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರ ಭೇಟಿಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡೂ ಖಂಡೇರಾಯನ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರಾ ದಳವಾಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಸ್ವಸ್ಥಾಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಹಣ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಹರವು ಮಾಡಿ ಪುನಹಾ ದಿಂಡುಗಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೊರಟು ಹೋದರು.

ತರುವಾಯ ಶೀಮೆಯಿಂದ ಪಟ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವೂ ಹರದೂ ಬರದೆ ಖಜಾನೆಯೂ ಬತ್ತಿ ಬಂದು ಫವುಜು ಸರದಾರರೂ ಸಹಾ ಯಲ್ಲಾ ಕೋಟೆ ವಳಗೆ ಜಮಾಯಿಸಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಿಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರು ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರುನ ಸಹಾ ಮನೆ ಬಾಗಿಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಪಾಯೇರು ದಂಗೇ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ್ದಾ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನ ಬಹದರರ ಕರಸಲಾಗಿ ಯಿವರು ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ದಳವಾಯಿಯವರನ್ನು ಪಟ್ಟಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಹೇಳಿ ಕರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ವಪ್ಪದೆ ಹೋದಕಾರಣ ಹೊರಗೆ ಗುಟ್ಟೆಮೇಲೆ ತೋಫುಗಳ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಸತ್ಯಮಂಗಲದ ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ಹೊಡದು ವುದ್ಯೋಗಸ್ತರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬೆದರಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಭಯಪಟ್ಟು ದಳವಾಯಿರಿಗೆ ತಿಳೀ ಹೇಳಿ ದಳವಾಯಿರು ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟುಬಂದರು.

ಆವಾಗಾ ಪಟ್ಣದಿಂದ್ದಾ ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಬಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದ್ದು ದಳವಾಯಿರ ಭೇಟಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಂಣತಂಮ್ಮಂದಿರ ಮನಸ್ತಾಪ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ವಾಗಿ ಪಟ್ಣಕೆ ಬಂದರು.

ಪಟ್ಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಿಷ್ಣರಾಜ ವಡೇರಿಗೆ ಶಿಖಾಸರಾ ಹಾಕಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವೋಲಗ ವಾಗಿ ದಳವಾಯಿರು ಅರಶಿನವರು ಕರ್ತರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾ ಪುನಹಾ ಕಷಾಯತ್ತಿದ್ದವಿಟು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನ ಬಹದರರೂ ವುಭಯ ಕಾವೇರೀ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಹಾರ್ನವುಮಿ ಮಂಟಪದ ಬಳಿ ದಂಡು ಯಿಳದರು.

ಶಕೆ ೧೬೮೦ ನೆ ಬಹುಧಾನ್ಯ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದ ಜೇಷ್ಠ ಶುಕ್ಲ ೨ರಲ್ಲು ದಳವಾಯಿ ದೇವರಾಜೈಯ್ಯನವರು ವೈಕುಂಠ ಪ್ರವೇಶವಾದರು.

ತರುವಾಯಾ ಮರಾಟೇರ ಕಡೆ ಸರದಾರನೂ ತಮಗೆ ವೋಲುಕೊಟ್ಟ ಶೀಮೆ ಮಟ್ಟಗೆ ಹದ್ದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಡಡೆ ಮತ್ತು ಶೀಮೇನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಠಾಣ್ಯ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಲೂ ಪಟ್ಣದ ಕಾವೇರೀ ನಧೀ ಪರ್ಯಂತ್ರ ದವುಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಶೀಮೇಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಂಗಾಮು ಹೇರಳ ವಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣಕಾಸುಗಳು ಬಾರದೆ ನಿಂತುಹೋಗಿ ಖಜಾನೆ ಹಣವೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿರಚನಾಪಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹೀಮು ಸಲಾಬತ್ತು ಜಂಗರು ನಾನಾರಾಯರ ಪೇಷ್ಕಶಿಗೆ ಸಹಾ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕರ್ತರು ಅರಶಿನವರ ಅಂತಃಪುರ ಕಲಹದಿಂದ ಫವುಜಿನ ಸರದಾರರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪಟ್ಣದ ಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಳಕೊಂಡು ನಿತ್ಯಚರಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕರ್ತರ ಮನೆ ಅರಶಿನವರ ಮನೆ ಬಾಗಿಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದಂಗೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಮನೆ ವಳಕ್ಕೆ ನೀರು ಬಿಡದೆ ಕೇವಲ ಮುಚ್ಚಿಡು ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ನಾಲ್ಕುದಿನ ಮೂರು ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ವಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿಖಾನರು ಕರ್ತರ ಬಳಿಗು ಅರಶಿನವರ ಬಳಿಗೂ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಯಿದ್ದರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಕರ್ತರು ಅರಶಿನವರು ಸಹಾ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಯಿಾ ಫವುಜಿನ ಡಂಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಯಾದರೂ ಸಾಹಸಮಾಡಿ ನೀವು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿ ಮಾತಿನ ವಾಶಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಹುತರವಾಗಿ ಸಮುದಾಯಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ್ದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಿವರು ಜವಾಬು ಕೊಟ ವಿವರಾ. ಯಿದು ವಿಷಮುಸಂಧಿ ವ್ಯಾಳೆ. ಖಾವಂದರಾದವರು ತಾವೆ ಯಿದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಹಸಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಚಂನವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಂಮಂತ್ಥಾ ಚಾಕರವಾನರು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲಾ. ಅಥವಾ ನಾವು ಯಿಾ ಕೆಲಸಕೆ ವುದ್ಯುಕ್ತ ವಾಗಿ ನಿಂತರೆ ಸರ್ವೇಜನಕ್ಕೂ ದ್ವೇಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಕ್ಷುದ್ರ್ಯಗಳಿಂದಾ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಚಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೂ ನಂಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಯಾಸರ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಅಬಂದರ ಆಗುವದೇ ವಿನಹಾ ಮತ್ತೊಂದಲಾವೆಂದು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನರು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿ ಅದೇನೂ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲಾ. ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲ್ಸ ನಂಮ್ಮ ಮಗನಾಗಿ ಯಿರುವ ನೀನೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವುಭಯು ಖಾವಂದರು ಹೇಳಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೀತಿಗೆ ಕರಾರುನಾಮೆ ಬರಶಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನರು ಕೇಳಿದರಾಗಿ ಕರಾರುನಾಮೆ ಬರಶಿಕೊಟ ವಿವರ. ತಾವು ತಂಮ್ಮ ಕುಟುಂಬ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ವಿನಹಾ ನಿಂತ ಜನ ಯಾರನ ಯಾರನ ನೀವು ದಂಡನೆ ಕಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ್ಯೂ ನಾವು ಆ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕದಿಲ್ಲಾ ಯಂಬದಾಗಿ ನೀವು ವುಭಯತ್ರ ಖಾವಂದರು ಕರಾರುನಾಮೆ ಬರಶಿ ದಸಕತ್ತು ಮೊಹರ ಮಾಡಿಶಿಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದರಿಂದಾ ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನರು ವಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಶಕೆ ೧೬೮೦ನೆ ಬಹುಧಾನ್ಯ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲು ಹೈದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾನರು ನಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಕರ್ತರ ದೇವಡಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಕೂಡುತ್ತಾ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರವಂನ್ನು ತಂಮ್ಮ ಬಗೆ ಖಂಡೇರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಮೊಕರೂರು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಸಕಲ ಪಣಕಟ್ಟುಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಗಳಂನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿತರಿಶಿ ನಯುದಿಂದಲೂ ಮೊಂಡರಿಗೆ ಮೇಖು ಥಡಾಯಿಸಿ ಕೊರಡೆಗಳ

ಯಿಂದಲೂ ಸಹಾ ಗರಮಾಗರಮಿಾಮಾಡಿ ಜನರಿಂಗಾ ನಜರಾನೆ ತೆಗದು ಹೇರಳ ಹಣ ಕಾಸುಗಳ ಜಮಮಾಡಿ ಫವುಜಿನ ಡಂಗೆಯೆಬ್ಬಿಸಿ ಕರಾರು ಬಾಕಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾ ಮಾಡಿಶಿ ಕೆಲವು ಹಣ ಭಟವಾಡೆ ಮಾಡಿಶಿ ೪೦೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ಬರತರಫು ಮಾಡಿಶಿ ೩೦೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಕರಿಯಿಟ್ಟು ಷರಾರತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದವರು ಭರತರ್ಫಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುವಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲೂಟೀ ಮಾಡಿ ಭರತರ್ಫ ಕುದುರೆ ಪೈಕಿ ಕೆಲವೂ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಲಾರಣಾ ಬರಶಿಕೊಂಡು ಪಟ್ಣದ ಕೋಟೆ ಬಾಗಿಲುಗಳ ಚವುಕೀ ಪಹರೇಕ್ಕೆ ತಂಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಬಾರಿನ ಜವಾನರನ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ಬಂದೋಬಸ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ಫವುಜುನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದು ಕಡತನಾಳು ಕೆಂಗಾಳು ಬೋರೇಮೋಲೆ ಯಿಳಿಸಿದರು.

ಪ್ರಾಕು ಕಲ್ಲಿಕೋಟೆ ಕಡೆ ಹಣದ ವರಾತದ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಯಿದ್ದ ಹರಿಶಿಂಗು ಜಮಾದಾರನು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡದೆ ಅವನಾಶಿ ಬಳಿ ಬಂದು ಯಿಳದನಾಗಿ ಹೈದರಲಿಖಾನರು ತಂಮ್ಮ ಭಾವಮೈದ ಮೊಕದುಂಸಾಬರ ಸಂಗಡ ಬಾರು ೨೦೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ೫೦೦ ಸಹಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಕಳುಹ್ಸಿ ಅವನ ದಂಡು ಲೂಟಿಸಿ ಹರಿಶಿಂಗನ ಹೊಡದುಹಾಕಿ ಬಹುಧಾಂನ್ಯ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲು ಕುದುರೆ ೩೦೦ ಬಂದೂಕ ೧೦೦೦ ತೋಫು ೩ ಆನೆ ೧ ಹ್ಯಾರಳ ಹಣಕಾಸು ಸಂಜಾಮು ಸಹ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಆಪೈಕಿ ಕುದುರೆ ೧೫ ತೋಫು ೩ ಆನೆ ೧ ಸಹಾ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು.

ಆ ಬಳಿಕ ಕರಾಚೂರಿ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಅರಶಿನವರು ತಂಮ್ಮ ಖಾಸಗೀ ಖರ್ಚು ಬಗ್ಯೆ ನೌಕರೀ ಬಗ್ಯೆ ಸಹಾ ಕುದುರೆ ೧೦೦೦ ಬಾರು ೩೦೦೦ ಸಹಾ ಯಿಟ್ಟು ನೌಕರಿಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಬಹದರವರ ಮುಖಾಂತ್ರಾ ಸವಾಲು ಮಾಡಿ ೩೦೦೦೦೦ ವರಹಾಕ್ಕೆ ಜಹಗೀರು ಕರಾರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡದೂ

೧ ನಾಮಕಲು	೧ ಬೆಟದಪುರ	೧ ಅನಂತಗಿರಿ
೧ ಪರಮರೆ	೧ ಅರಕಲಗೂಡು	೧ ಮೈಸೂರು
೧ ಶ್ಯಾದಮಂಗಲ	೧ ಕೊಣನೂರು	೧ ಕಟಿಮಳಲವಾಡಿ
		೧ ಪಿರೀಪಟ್ಣ

ಯಿಾ ಹತ್ತು ತಾಲೋಕು ೩೦೦೦೦೦ ವರಹಾದ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಜಹಗೀರುಕೊಡಿಶಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿರಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲ ಕೊಣನೂರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಶಿನವರು ಯಿರು ವಂತ್ತೆ ಮೊಕರೂರು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸ್ತರು.

ಸದರಿ ಶಖೆ ೧೬೮೦ ನೆಯ ಬಹುಧಾಂನ್ಯ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಟೀರ ಕಡೆ ಮುಕುಂದರಾಯನೆಂಬವನು ಯಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ೫೦೦ ಕುದುರೆಯಿಂದ ಯರಡುದಿನ ಮೂರುದಿನಕೆ ವಂದೊಂದು ತಡವೆ ತಪ್ಪದೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪ್ಯಾಟೆ ಹೊಕ್ಕು ಲೂಟಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶೀಮೇನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಾರಾಜು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೋಟೆಗೆ ರಸ್ತು ಬಿಡದೆ ಬಹಳ ಮುಗ್ಗಡೆಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ್ದ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಿಂದ

ಬರಕ್ಕಿ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯರ ಮಗ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾಯರು ಕರ್ತರ ಅರಶಿನವರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೋಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗದೆ ಹೊರಚ್ಚ್ಯಾಸೆ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆಯಿಂದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಬರುವ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ೪೦ ಜನ ಸವಾರರಿಂದ ಅಡಗಿಯಿದ್ದು ಅರುಣೋದಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆಯಿಂದ ಮುಕುಂದರಾಯ ೫೦೦ ಕುದುರೆ ಸಹಾ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಾರ್ಗವಾಗಿ ಬರುವಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕುಕಡೆಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅವನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕುದುರೆ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಹೊಡದು ಅವರು ಬೆಂನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿ ಬೆಂನಟ್ಟಿ ಹೊಸ ಕೋಟೆ ಪೇಟೆವಳಗೂ ಹೊಕ್ಕು ಕಡದು ಬಹುಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಜಖಂಮಾಡಿ ನೂರಾರು ಕುದುರೆ ಹಿಡಕೊಂಡೂ ಪತ್ತೆಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ದಾಖಲಾದರು.

ಬರಕ್ಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾಯರು ಸದರಿ ಬಹುಧಾಂನ್ಯ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದಲ್ಲೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ತಂದ ಕುದುರೆ ಸಹಾ ಯಿಂನೂರು ಕುದುರೆ ಜಮಾಯಿಶಿ ನಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ ಪ್ಯಾಟೆ ಲೂಟಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವುಬ್ಬುಸಾ ಮಾಡಿದಕಾರಣ ಮುಕುಂದರಾಯನು ಮರಾಟೇರ ಬಗೆ ಮಿರ್ಜೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಹರಿ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾವು ರಾಸ್ತೆ ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಣಶೀಮೆ ಆರ್ಕಾಟಶೀಮೆ ಚವುಥಾಯ ಹಣದ ನಿಮಿತ್ಯಾ ಯಿಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಚರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಯಿದ್ದವರಿಗೆ ಪಿರ್ಯಾದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆವರ ಫವುಜು ಕುದುರೆ ೪೦೦೦೦ ವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾಗಿ ಪಾಯದಳ ಸಹಾ ತಂದೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಮುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾಯರು ಬಹಳ ಲಡಾಯಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾಯಿದ್ದರು.

ಆವಾಗ ಸದರಿ ಫವುಜು ಮದ್ದೂರು ಚೆಂನಪಟ್ಣ ಸಹಾ ಠಾಣೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಲಡಾಯಿ ಆಗೂವಲ್ಲೂ ಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಧಾನ್ಯ ಮುಗಿದು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಗೋಷ್ಟಾದ ಕಾರಣ ಪಟಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ವಿವರ ಬರಕ್ಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ರಾಯರು ಪಟ್ಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತು ಮುಗೀತು ತಿಂಡಿಗೆ ಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಜನ ನಿಲ್ಲದು ನಾನಂತ್ತೂ ಕೋಟೆ ವಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಹೆಣಮೋರೆಯಿಂದಾ ಖಾವಂದಿರ ಯೆದುರಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕದಿಲ್ಲಾ ರಸ್ತಿನ ಕುಮುಕು ಜಲದು ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕೋಟೆಯು ಸಂಗಡ ತಂನ ಶರೀರ ಸಹಾ ನಿಂಮ್ಮ ಯಿಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪದಲ್ಲೆ ದೂರವಾಗುತೆಂದು ಕರ್ತರಿಗೆ ನಂಜರಾಜೈಯ್ಯ ಆರಶಿನವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಬಿಂನವತ್ತಲೆ ತಂಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆ ವೆಂಕಟರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಸಹಾ ಲಕ್ಕೋಟು ೩ ಕ್ಕು ಗುಟ್ಟು ಕಡ್ಡಿಕಟ್ಟಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸ್ತಕಾರಣ ಯಂಕಟರಾಯರು ವುಭಯಖಾವಂದರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಸರ್ವಸಾಹಸಾ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ರಸ್ತು ಕುಮುಕ್ಕು ಸಹಾ ಪಟ್ಣದಿಂದಾ ಆಗುವ ಮಟ್ಟು ಯಾವ ಸರದಾರನ ವಿಚಾರಿಶಿ ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ನಿರ್ವಾಹ ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲವಾಯಿತು.

(ಮುಂದುವರೆಯುವುದು) *(to be continued)*

REVIEWS

PRAPANCHA-SĀRA-SANGRAHA, Parts I and II. Published by the Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library, Thanjavur. 1962 and 1963. Edited by K. S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Pages 992 (Both Volumes), Price Rs.: 21-00, Volume I, Rs. 18-50, Volume II.

Gīrvāṇendra Saraswatī, disciple of Viśveśvara Sarasvathī, and teacher of Nṛsimhaśvāmi, has assiduously compiled more than Six Hundred Sixty ritualistic details in connection with different deities worshipped by the Hindus of the present day. The *mantras*, *tantras* and *dhyānaślōkas* of the deities are given in detail in this voluminous compilation of Thirty-two sections (*paṭalas*). This rare manuscript has been edited with skill and accuracy by Shri K. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, who worked for long as Pandit of The Sarasvathi Mahal Library, Tanjore. The Union Government deserves commendation for having financed this publication.

The volumes are a remarkable store-house of highly interesting details about our ritualistic worship. The sections are classified accordingly to the traditional division of deities, Vaiṣṇavite, Śaivite, Śākta and miscellaneous. In each case, the several stages of worship (*navāvarṇa*, *pīthapūjā*, *añganyāsa*, *karanyāsa*, *argya*, *prayōga*, *dhyāna*, etc.) are indicated along with appropriate *mantras*. Besides, the deities and their worship involved in normal daily life, several modes of worship with regard to special occasions like ill-health, snake-bite, loss of wealth, harrassment by enemies, famine, war and ill-will of beloved folk are also included. The compiler has painstakingly brought together a wealth of material concerning the occult phenomena and the dark forces responsible for them. He has listed several goblins (*yakṣiṇis*) and sylvan spirits, numerous aspects of Gaṇēśa, Narasimha, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Sākti and the *grahas*.

The student of Indian Iconography will find the book very interesting. Detailed descriptions of more than five hundred gods and goddesses are to be found in these two volumes. It is true

that many of the deities listed in this work are obsolete, but the book will lend an insight into the religious beliefs of mediaeval India.

It would serve a larger interest if the work is translated into English. Esoteric and occult as the work undoubtedly is, it would throw light on several aspects of Indian culture, religion, mythology, folk-lore and philosophy.

The Editor has done his job meticulously and has spared no pains to make the volumes free from flaws both in printing and in grammar. The Sarasvathi Mahal Library has done well in taking up this work for publication.

—Prof. S. K. RAMACHANDRA RAO

RAIN IN INDIAN LIFE AND LORE. Edited by Sankara Sen Gupta. Published by Indian Publications, 3, British India Street, Calcutta-1. 1963. pp. 138. Price: Rs. 12-00.

This is an interesting collection of articles on rain from scholars belonging to different provinces of India. The articles give an insight into the folk-lore and myths associated with the rainy season, prevalent in several anthropologically distinct groups of people in the country. The Rains, being an important and mysterious phenomenon, have worked several curious beliefs and practices, both in regard to production and prevention. People surrounded these beliefs and practices with music and dance, poetry and story so that the rainy season is full of hope and happiness. It is welcome therefore that the Journal *Folklore* has brought out this volume on Rain.

The essays are full of anthropological interest. Ganesh Chaubey's essay on Rain Compelling rites in Bihar, Sarin's essay on the same theme in The Panjab are interesting; Savitri Sukla explains the same set of rites as prevalent in the Uttar Pradesh. Dinesh Narayan Chakravarty and Usha Chakravarty have contributed rather an intriguing essay on 'Invocation of the Rains ranging from Ṛgveda to Rabindranath.' The range is

unimaginably wide and it is foolhardy to seek to make the article meticulously comprehensive. The authors have selected the poets of the Ṛgveda, Vālmiki and Kālidāsa for mention. They appear to have got the inspiration for this article from Rabindranatha's *Varsla-mangala-kalpanā.* The verse they have quoted is lovely:

शतेके युगेर कविदल मिलि आकाशे
ध्वनिया तुलिछे मत्तमन्दिर वातासे शतेकयुगेरगीतिका
शतशतगीतमुखरितवनवीथिका ।

Bireswar Banerjee has discussed the mechanism of rainfall from a cool, scientific viewpoint: it is in striking contrast to the other essays in the book. It may well have been omitted from this collection, as it is more mateorological than anthropological.

In the appendix is given some prevalent superstitions in regard to rain. The book is also equipped with some art plates relating to the rainy season.

The book is a useful addition to the growing literature on anthropological subjects; and the editor is to be congratulated for this painstaking compilation of learned essays.

—Prof. S. K. RAMACHANDRA RAO

At the First of the Three East African National Books Week held at Tanzania at Dar-es-Salaam this year (1967) the Indian High Commissioner, Sri N. V. Rao, presented One Hundred and Twenty selected books on India to Tanzania's National Library, as India's contribution to Tanzania's National Book Week.

* * *

The Publication of a Tantrick Work *Mahākāli Saṁhita* in Ten Volumes at a cost of One Lakh Thirty-Eight Thousand Rupees by the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, has been approved by the Union Government.

* * *